

S.N. 10/692,104

RD-29583-2

REMARKS

In the office action mailed April 20, 2005, the claims 14-20 and 22-24 were indicated as being allowable and claims 1-13 and 21 were rejected. In the present response, claims 2-4, 6 and 13 have been cancelled leaving claims 1, 5, 7-12 and 14-24 pending. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application by the Examiner in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C 112, first paragraph. The subject Office Action stated that the specification, while being enabling for the non-polar co-solvents and alkylamines disclosed in the specification, does not reasonable provide enablement for any non-polar solvent and any alkylamine. Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's position, Applicants have elected to not address the merits of the Examiner's rejections at this time, but explicitly reserve the right to do so if deemed necessary in the future. Rather, for the purpose of prosecutorial expediency, Applicants have elected to amend claim 1 to more clearly particularize the claim. More specifically, amended claim 1 is drawn to a cleaning composition and now recites:

an emulsion comprising a polar co-solvent and a non-polar co-solvent; and
at least one alkylamine dispersed throughout the emulsion in an amount effective to prevent inversion of the emulsion, the at least one alkylamine selected from the group consisting of hexylamine, octylamine, decylamine, dodecylamine, hexyldecylamine, and $(\text{CH}_3)_3\text{CCH}_2\text{C}(\text{CH}_3)_2\text{NH}_2$.

In particular, the at least one alkylamine selected from the group consisting of hexylamine, octylamine, decylamine, dodecylamine, hexyldecylamine, and $(\text{CH}_3)_3\text{CCH}_2\text{C}(\text{CH}_3)_2\text{NH}_2$. Applicants submit that amended claim 1 is definite and

S.N. 10/692,104

RD-29583-2

request that the rejection to claim 1 and its current dependent claims under §112 be removed.

Claims 12, 13 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, the subject Office Action stated that claims 12 and 13 were confusing because an alkylamine is a compound, not a composition, and so cannot comprise an aminosiloxane.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection with respect to claims 12 and 13. Nonetheless, Applicants have cancelled claim 12 thereby rendering the rejection of claim 12 under §112 as moot. In addition, claim 13 has been made to depend from claim 11. Claim 11 now recites "an emulsion comprising a polar co-solvent and decamethylcyclopentasiloxane; and an aminosiloxane dispersed throughout the emulsion in an amount effective to prevent inversion of the emulsion." Claim 13 in turn recites that "the aminosiloxane is diendcapped with n-propylamine functionality." Applicants submit that claims amended claims 11 and 13 are definite and request that the rejection to claims 12 and 13 under §112 be removed.

With respect to the rejection of claim 21, Applicants disagree and respectfully traverse this rejection. The Office Action stated that claim 21 is confusing as ammonium hydroxide is not a solvent. Applicants submit that Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary 10th Edition defines a 'solvent' as "a usu. liquid substance capable of dissolving or dispersing one or more other substances." Applicants submit that ammonium hydroxide is at the very least *capable* of dissolving or dispersing one or more other substances. For at least this reason, Applicants request that the rejection to claim 21 under §112 be removed.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

S.N. 10/692,104

RD-29583-2

Claims 1, 2 and 9 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by D'Albignac et al., US 3,807,949. As indicated above, amended claim 1 recites:

an emulsion comprising a polar co-solvent and a non-polar co-solvent; and
at least one alkylamine dispersed throughout the emulsion in an amount effective to prevent inversion of the emulsion, the at least one alkylamine selected from the group consisting of hexylamine, octylamine, decylamine, dodecylamine, hexyldecylamine, and $(\text{CH}_3)_3\text{CCH}_2\text{C}(\text{CH}_3)_2\text{NH}_2$.

Applicants respectfully submit that D'Albignac does not teach or otherwise suggest all the elements of amended claim 1. For at least this reason Applicants submit that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by D'Albignac and is in condition for allowance. As claims 5 and 7-10 currently depend from claim 1, Applicants submit that claims 5 and 7-10 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Applicants submit that claim 2 has been cancelled thereby rendering the rejection to claim 2 under §102(b) as moot.

Claims 1, 2, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Harakal et al., US 4,936,917. Applicants respectfully submit that Harakal does not teach or otherwise suggest all the elements of amended claim 1. For at least this reason Applicants submit that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Harakal and is in condition for allowance. As claims 5 and 7-10 currently depend from claim 1, Applicants submit that claims 5 and 7-10 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Applicants submit that claim 2 has been cancelled thereby rendering the rejection to claim 2 under §102(b) as moot.

Claims 1, 2, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Freiberg et al., US 5,066,520. Applicants respectfully submit that Freiberg does not teach or otherwise suggest all the elements of amended claim 1. For at least this reason Applicants submit that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Freiberg and is in condition for allowance. As claims 5 and 7-10 currently depend from claim 1, Applicants submit that claims 5 and 7-10 are allowable for at least the same

S.N. 10/692,104

RD-29583-2

reasons as claim 1. Applicants submit that claim 2 has been cancelled thereby rendering the rejection to claim 2 under §102(b) as moot.

Conclusion

In response to the Examiner's rejections, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 7, 8, 11 and 13 have been amended solely for the purpose of clarification and not to overcome any cited reference(s).

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are patentable and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested. Allowance of claims at an early date is solicited.

7/20/05

Date

Respectfully submitted,



Jason K. Klindtworth
Attorney for the Applicants
Registration No. 47,211
(518) 387-7360

General Electric Company
1 Research Circle
Building K1, Room 3A65
Schenectady, New York 12345